

Amendments to the Drawing

Delete original Fig. 4 and replace it with a new Fig. 4, a formal sheet of which is attached at the end of this Reply. New Fig. 4 is presented herewith in which the reference label for element 2d has been corrected.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet
 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

REMARKS

The Official Action of June 9, 2005, and the prior art relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 1-5 and 8, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. The applicants accordingly respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The PTO has objected to applicants' drawings. The objection is respectfully traversed.

To obviate this objection, applicants' specification has been amended on page 16 to refer to element 1b. In addition, a new Fig. 4 is presented herewith in which the reference label for element 2d has been corrected.

Withdrawal of the objection is in order and is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4/1, 5/1/, 4/2 and 5/2 have been rejected under Section 102 as anticipated by the Suzuki et al publication '068 ("Suzuki"). In addition, claims 3, 4/3 and 5/3 have been rejected as obvious under Section 103 from Suzuki. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Neither claims 6 or 7 have been included in these rejections. The independent claims 1-3 have now been amended to incorporate aspects particularly of previous claim 7. Such features are not shown or made obvious by Suzuki.

Thus, in contrast to Suzuki, applicants' claims 1-3 recite features that the reflection surface includes a textured reflection surface and asymmetric prisms. Suzuki, on the other hand, discloses that the reflection sheet 4 is disposed on the lower surface of the light guide plate 11, and that a white colored material, a metal such as silver, aluminum, or the like, or a material coated with the silver and so on are used for the reflection sheet 4 (see page 4, paragraph 0061). Thus, Suzuki discloses no reflection surface including a textured reflection surface and asymmetric prisms.

Withdrawal of the rejections based on Suzuki under Sections 102 and 103 is in order and is respectfully requested.

Claims 6/1, 7/1, 6/2, 7/2, 6/3 and 7/3 have been rejected as obvious under Section 103 from Suzuki in view of Taira et al USP '694 ("Taira"). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Suzuki has been briefly described above. Taira discloses the light-guiding plate 103 having at the lower surface thereof inverted depressed portions 1201 (Fig. 14), or

the light-guiding plate 1506 having at the lower surface thereof inverted V-shaped grooves 1509 (Fig. 20). Although it might be considered that such depressed portions or the V-shaped grooves might correspond to the asymmetric prisms, the textured reflection surface in applicants' invention is not disclosed in Taira. Thus, Taira does not disclose **both** a textured reflection surface **and** asymmetric prisms. The combination as claimed provides improved light scattering.

Accordingly, even if it were obvious to combine Taira with Suzuki by modifying Suzuki to incorporate the inverted portions 1201 of Fig. 14 or 1509 of Fig. 20 of Taira into Suzuki, this would not reach the claimed subject matter.

Moreover, applicants respectfully submit that the combination would not have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made. Contrary to what is stated in the rejection, applicants do not see that Taira teaches any particular advantages of adopting e.g. the construction of Fig. 20; in other words, Fig. 20 is merely an equivalent alternative to the other embodiments of Taira. One having ordinary skill in the art would not be inclined to adopt such a cost-increasing feature without any expectation of any improved result.

Further in this regard, the rejection states that the proposed combination would have been obvious "to improve

the brightness of the back light uniformly." However, the present invention flies in the face of that concept in that non-uniformity is provided in the present invention, and this improves light scattering. Applicants' invention defines unobvious subject matter.

Withdrawal of the rejection is in order and is respectfully requested.

New claim 8 focuses on subject matter of the type which is shown, for example, in Fig. 4 wherein the textured surface is near the front and the asymmetric prisms are downstream therefrom. The light scattering is further increased in this regard because the textured reflection surface is formed near the light receiving side surface of the light guide plate and the asymmetric prisms are formed far away from the light receiving side surface of the light guide plate. The structure recited in new claim 8 makes it possible to achieve illumination in which the emission lines are inconspicuous in the area near the light receiving side surface of the light guide plate.

Accordingly, claim 8 defines non-obvious subject matter not only because it depends alternatively from any of claims 1-3 which is patentable, but also because it adds additional non-obvious subject matter.

Appln. No. 10/689,733
Amd. dated September 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2005

Applicants believe they have addressed all issues raised in the Office Action in a manner which should lead to patentability. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "S. Neimark", written over a horizontal line.

Sheridan Neimark
Registration No. 20,520

SN:jec
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\A\Asak\Okuwaki1\Pto\AMD 09 SEPT 05.doc



Appln. No. 10/689,733
Amdt. Dated September 9, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2005
Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Fig . 4

